DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 853 SP 029 750

AUTHOR Speak, Lynda; Britton, Nancy
TITLE What Do Staff Developers Need To Know about Implementation of Training?
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Content; Elementary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Knowledge Level; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Research Utilization; Staff Development; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a study which explored the variables of teacher knowledge of content, teacher attitude toward the content, and span of time with regard to implementation of selected teaching practices in the elementary classroom. The 32 elementary classroom teachers who comprised the sample received 2 days of training in instructional practices based on the work of Madeline Hunter. Upon completion of the training, the teachers completed a test designed to measure content knowledge and attitude. Using the test data, four strata were determined. Teachers in each stratum were observed four weeks after completion of the training and again eight weeks after the training. An implementation score was determined for each of the classroom observations. Results indicate that high content knowledge had a significant relationship to classroom implementation. No significance was found for attitude or for span of time in terms of their relationship to classroom implementation. Factors that may explain these findings are presented as well as suggestions for further research. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289853

WHAT DO STAFF DEVELOPERS NEED TO KNOW ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING?

Although inservice education has become an integral part of today's educational system, there is little solid evidence to provide clear directions for planning, presenting, and evaluating inservice or staff development programs. O'Neill describes the research on inservice as very narrow and states, "a lot is being written about inservice, but not being researched" (1986, p. 1).

Extensive staff development will be required if the nation is to meet the challenge for school improvement as called for in such reports as A Nation at Risk (1983) and to respond to changing the grim picture of America's schools in Goodlad's A Place Called School (1983). Wood and Thompson predict "the 1980's will be the decade of staff development (1980, p. 374).

In Texas, teachers are required to participate in eight days of inservice training each school year. Inservice training is costly and time consuming. School districts need information to use in planning and in assessing staff development programs. Given the changing population of America's teachers, pictured by Ducharme (1986, p. 43). as "staying, but greying", programs must help teachers adapt to

SP 029 750

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Speak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

changes and adjust their teaching behavior for maximum effectiveness and efficiency.

For years, teachers have participated in staff development activities. How much of an impact has this training had in the classroom? To answer this question, one must first look at teacher behavior after inservice or staff development training. Do teachers act on inservice training? If so, what are the factors that cause them to act?

Hunter has suggested that research is needed to answer the question "what does it take to cause 'ordinary' teachers to internalize practice so it is self-sustaining" (1986, p. 1). Answers to questions such as these must precede the search for answers to the more critical question of the impact of inservice training on student learning. Researchers like Hall and Loucks conclude that "the only way to know for sure whether and how an innovation is being used is to assess each individual's use directly" (1977, p.263).

BACKGROUND

Principles of Effective Teaching and Learning (PETL) is a staff development program in Richardson (TX) designed to present some of the essential skills of instruction. This program began in 1982 when five district trainers studied at UCLA with Madeline Hunter. In the spring of 1983, principals, assistant principals, Instruction Services

personnel, and twenty-five teachers attended 2 1/2-3 days of inservice. During the 1983-1984 school year the personnel of twelve elementary schools and the department chairpersons of the secondary schools received approximately 20 hours of instruction. In 1984-1985 all principals, assistant principals, and Central Instruction staff attended four days of inservice on Clinical Supervision and a review of PETL. Beginning in 1985-1986, the content of PETL I was offered to all professional personnel in the district. This was accomplished by a cadre of district trainers which included four elementary principals, three assistant principals, and a consulting teacher.

District support for and commitment to the program was clearly defined with the naming of two full-time trainers for 1986-1987. The schedules of seminars was expanded to include not only non-duty time seminars but also release days from classroom duties.

Operation

All professional personnel in the Richardson Independent School District are required to complete two days of PETL training by May 1988. Most of the administrative and support personnal have completed this requirement in completing the state required Instructional Leadership Training and the training described above.

Teachers may earn their PETL credit in a variety of ways including inservice days, release days from classroom duties, and during Equivalency Time Programs (ETP) offered on non-school time. It is anticipated that all professional personnel with two or more years with the district will complete the two-day requirement by May 1988.

Teachers who participate in the PETL training are asked to assume responsibility for their own learning by completing a self-commitment form at the conclusion of PETL II indicating their intent to follow-up the training. This follow-up ranges from self-follow-up to a classroom observation by one of the PETL specialists. Principals receive copies of the self-commitment and are aware of the necessity of follow-up if implementation is to occur and if maintenance of the teaching strategies is to continue.

An assessment of the teachers' knowledge and anticipated use of the seminar concepts is completed during the second days' training. Teachers are provided their scores in a post seminar letter.

For the 1987-1988 school year, three types of PETL seminars are offered: PETL I, PETL II, and Advanced PETL. PETL I is the beginning level and is offered mainly for teachers who are new to RISD. The content consists of an overview to the essential elements of teaching and content

sessions on Teaching to the Objective, Active Participation, and Anticipatory Set.

PETL II is for professional employees who have completed PETL I. The content includes a review of key PETL I objectives and new content sessions on Formulating Objectivs, Task Analysis, Motivation Theory, and Closure.

Advanced PETL is offered for teachers who participated in the PETL pilot in 1983-1984 and for teachers who have completed PETL I and II. The content includes a review of Bloom's Taxonomy, Anticipatory Set, and Closure, as well as new content on extending student thinking through the four teacher actions of Teaching to the Objective. A method of presenting information and activities that encourages higher levels of thinking is presented. Questioning strategies and responding techniques for promoting higher levels of thinking are discussed.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study explored the relationship of teachers' knowledge of content, teachers' attitude toward selected teaching strategies and teachers' use of those strategies in the elementary classroom on both a short term and a long-term basis.

The Population

The population considered in this study was comprised of 148 elementary classroom teachers in Richardson, Texas. The teachers in the population group all teach reading or mathematics in grades one through six and completed their FETL II training on a release day within a four-week time period. Teachers in this group varied in gender, ethnicity, age, years or teaching experience, and level of attained education. Their training sessions were heterogenous and included elementary and secondary classroom teachers, elementary and secondary special area teachers, and administrators.

The Sample

All teachers in the study population were given a FETL II post-test which included thirty-four items designed to measure knowledge of seminar content and seventeen items designed to measure attitude toward the seminar content. The range of raw scores on the content portion of the test was from 20 to 32. The range of mean scores on the attitude part of the test was from 3.82 to 5.00.

The scores were arranged from highest to lowest for ease in determining quartiles. The results of this calculation may be seen in Table. I. Using the Upper Quartile (Q_3) and the Lower Quartile (Q_1), four strata were determined as reported in Table II.

Scores were then arranged into the four strata illustrated in Table II. Since both content knowledge and attitude were variables considered in this study, this arrangement of the scores eliminated 108 teachers in the population group whose scores did not fall into one of the four groups illustrated. Using a table of random numbers, eight teachers were then selected from each stratum to form the study sample.

TABLE I

SCORES ON PETL II TEST

Percentile Range	Content Range	Attitude Range
75% (N = 37)	29-32	4.94-5.00
26-74% (N = 74)	25-28	4.60-4.93
-25% (N = 37)	20-24	3.83-4.59

TABLE II

TEST SCORE STRATA

Group	Content Raw Score Range	Attitude Mean Score Range
High Content Knowledge High Positive Attitude	29-32	4.94-5.00
High Content Knowledge Low Positive Attitude	29-32	3.82-4.59
Low Content Knowledge High Positive Attitude	20-24	4.94-5.00
Low Content Knowledge Low Positive Attitude	20-24	3.83-4.59

Study Design

The eight teachers in each of the four sample strata were observed two times following the completion of the PETL II seminar. The scheduled observations were in the teacher's own reading or mathematics classroom and lasted

from thirty minutes to one hour. The observations concluded when the lesson ended.

The first observations were completed within a time period of twenty-one to twenty-eight days and the second observations were completed within a time period of forty-nine to fifty-six days. One of the two staff development specialists observed each teacher and recorded findings on a PETL Classroom Observation Form.

Inter-rater reliability of the two staff development specialists was established by computing a Pearson Product Moment correlation on scores obtained by the two observers in viewing video tapes and live lessons of five classroom teachers. Each observer completed the PETL Classsroom Observation Form independently for each of the teachers observed. A correlation of .90 was found.

Instrumentation

A criterion-referenced test was used to determine knowledge of content. The test, which covers the seminar objectives of the PETL program, was constructed by the staff development specialists. Content validity and congruency were validated by a panel of experts. Internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) of .53 was found in a pilot testing (N = 116) of the instrument. Raw scores were used in determining the stratified groups for sampling purposes and in analyzing the data.

Attitude was measured by participants' responses to seventeen items presented on a Likert-type scale. The item addressed presentation and format of the seminar, value and utility, and anticipated degree of implementation. The scale was constructed by the staff development specialists. Content validity was validated by a panel of experts. Internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) of .88 was found in a pilot testing (n = 116) of the instrument. Mean scores were used in determining the stratified groups for sampling purposes and in analyzing the data.

The instrument used to record classroom implementation was the PETL Classroom Observation Form. This form, patterned after the Texas Teacher Appraisal System, lists the observable indicators for each of the major content objectives taught in the PETL seminars. Content validity and congruency were validated by a panel of experts. As previously noted, inter-rater reliability of the observers was established at .90. The observers made notes in a script-taping manner during the actual observations. Following the observation, the observers completed the PETL Classroom Observation Form indicating whether the competency indicator was absent or below standard, was of standard expectation, or was of exceptional quality. A total raw score was used for data analysis with the highest raw score possible being forty.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

After the second classroom observation was completed for all teachers in the study sample, the data were analyzed using three-way analysis of variance with repeated measures. Independent variables were content, attitude, and span of time with the classroom observation scores as the dependent variable. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine significance.

FINDINGS

This study explored the relationship of content knowledge, attitude, and span of time from completion of training with regard to implementation of selected teaching practices in the elementary classroom. The data collected for this statistical analysis included (1) teacher raw scores on the content portion of the PETL II test, (2) teacher mean scores on the attitude portion of the PETL II test, (3) teacher classroom implementation score twenty-one to twenty-eight days after completion of the PETL II seminar, and (4) teacher classroom implementation score forty-nine and fifty-six days after completing the PETL II seminar.

Study Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, seven hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Three hypotheses addressed significant main effects for the three independent variables: content knowledge, attitude, and span of time. Three hypotheses addressed the interaction between the independent variables paired: content knowledge and attitude, content knowledge and span of time, and attitude and span of time. The seventh hypothesis dealt with three-way interaction of the three independent hypotheses.

Demographic Data

Although the demographic data collected were not part of the design of this study, they are an additional source of information. The thirty-two teachers in the sample are teachers in twenty-one different elementary schools in Richardson, Texas. Richardson Independent School District is a suburban school district with an average student enrollment of over 30,000. Located in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, Richardson is a community made up primarily of middle to upper class residents, the majority of whom work outside of the city itself.

All grade levels, one through six, were represented by the three male and twenty-nine female teachers in this study. The range of total years teaching experience was from two to thirty-one years with an average of twelve years. The range of experience in the district was from two to twenty-seven years with the average being nine years.

Seventeen of the thirty-two teachers hold bachelor's degrees with the remaining fifteen holding master's degrees.

Content Knowledge

Results of the three-way analysis of variance for content knowledge indicated that high knowledge of content had a significant relationship to classroom implementation. Differences between the implementation means for teachers with high content knowledge and for teachers with low content knowledge were found to be significant at less then the .05 level. Teachers with high content knowledge implemented the selected teaching strategies to a greater degree then did teachers with low content knowledge. When the interaction of the other variables was calculated, the significance of content knowledge did not change.

Attitude

No significance was found for attitude in terms of its relationship to classroom implementation. Attitude was not found to be significant when the interaction of the other variables was calculated.

Span of Time from Training

The relationship of span of time to implementation was not found to be significant. No significance was found for span of time when the interaction of the other variables was calculated.

INTERPRETATIONS

Researchers such as Fullan (1982), Wallace (1984), Hunter (1985), and Mohlman, Coladarci, and Gage (1982) have found that implementation is very complicated and that there is a need to look at many factors. Robbins (1986) and Hunter (1986) stress the complexity of assessing implementation, a view supported by Cox (1983), Berman and McLaughlin (1978), and by Cooley and Thompson (1987). The results of this study indicate that classroom implementation of selected teaching strategies does occur and has a significant relationship to the teachers' content knowledge of those teaching strategies. Evans reached a similar conclusion in a study of implementation of a program similar to the PETL program of this study. She notes, "PET translated theories into behaviors that are easily observed in efficient and effective teachers" (1982, p. 44). The findings of this study indicate that the teachers' attitude and span of time have no significant relationship to the teachers' classroom implementation of selected teaching strategies.

Content Knowledge

This study provides a measure of content knowledge, a factor not widely practiced in inservice education (Lawrence,1981) (Wallace, 1984). The findings of this study support the notion that teachers can learn content, a view supported by Joyce and Showers (1980, 1981) and by

McCormick (1979) and that this content knowledge is a significant factor in classroom implementation. These findings help to answer questions about the impact of training on knowledge acquisition (Joyce and Showers, 1980, 1981) and about conditions for adults to learn (Arin-Krupp, 1981, 1982) (Bents and Howey, 1981) (Glickman,1985) (Joyce,Hersh, and McKibbin,1983) (Wood and Thompson, 1980). Given these findings and the significance of content knowledge, educators involved in inservice training for teachers may want to place renewed emphasis on acquisition of content and on the impact of cognitive activities in inservice sessions (Glickman, 1986) (Harris, 1975).

Attitude

This study yielded information which would indicate that teachers who have high content knowledge have a greater degree of implementation than those with low content knowledge regardless of their attitude. The findings of this study do not support the position of researchers such as Robbins (1986) who concluded that the most important factor in teacher implementation is attitude. Based on the results of this current study, it could be concluded that the benefits of inservice training, such as that described in this paper, are equally beneficial to those with a high positive attitude and to those with a low positive attitude.

This study differs from the Robbins study in several ways, two of which are particularly relevant to the

consideration of attitude as a variable in implementation. The Robbins study was conducted over a four-year period of time during which time attitude was measured both formally and informally several times. Teachers who participated in the study described by Robbins also received interim trining and feedback from knowledgeable sources, factors which may have a direct impact on attitude.

It may be that an immediate measure of attitude at the end of an inservice session yields a different quality of assessment from a measure of attitude which is on-going and is assessed not only at the end of a training session, but extends into the follow-through part of the program over a longer period of time. Given the findings of this study, in which no significant difference was found in classroom implementation between teachers with low attitude and teachers with high attitude, it may be that an assessment of teacher commitment rather than teacher attitude would yield data significant for inservice education.

Span of Time

Findings of this current study support the position that transfer of training, or implementation, does occur with teachers who have high knowledge of content and that this implementation does not vary significantly when observed on a short-term and a long-term basis. The work of Hall and Loucks (1977) and Guskey (1986) indicates that change takes time. Robbins (1986) found that degree of

implementation actually declined in the fourth year of her study, but this decline was attributed to factors other than time. The findings of this study do not support the idea that implementation may increase or decrease over time. It appears that teachers who have knowledge of concepts such as those presented in the inservice sessions of this study which are based on "sound psychological principles of learning and correlational research" (Slavin, 1986, p. 165) will use those strategies in the classroom within a short time after the completion of their training and that this usage will continue over a longer period of time. It may also be that variables not measured in this study could help to account for this finding.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, several conclusions may be reached.

1. According to the findings of this study, knowledge of content had a significant relationship to the elementary classroom teachers' implementation of the selected teaching strategies. The findings suggest that teachers who have learned the content of an inservice session are able to and do implement that training.

2. Of equal significance, based on the findings of this study, is the conclusion that teachers who do not know the content are not able to implement the teaching

strategies. This lends support to the view of teaching as both a science and an art. Teachers who do not possess the specific skills, the science, of teaching are not able to demonstrate those skills in the classroom in the presence of a trained observer.

3. Teacher attitude toward specific teaching strategies has no significant relationship to the teachers' use of those strategies in the elementary classroom. It may be that the intellect overrides the emotions, and that teachers who possess knowledge of the strategies will use those strategies regardless of their attitude about them. The findings of this study would support the position that the training was of benefit to both the low and the high attitude teachers.

4. The data analyzed in this study indicate that teachers who have high content knowledge of the selected teaching strategies use those strategies to a greater degree than teachers with low content knowledge and that this implementation does not vary significantly over a span of time. This finding suggests that teachers who have the cognitive knowledge of teaching strategies will use them within a short span of time and will continue to use them. This is in contrast to views that would suggest that teachers need time after training to assimilate the concepts before using them or that teachers who have the skills will

use them for a short period of time and then discontinue their use, perhaps reverting to former teaching techniques.

5. Given the complexity of assessing transfer or implementation of inservice training, as described in the literature, it may be that there are other significant variables with regard to classroom implementation of training that have not been measured. These might include the teachers' own level of educational attainment; the teachers' placement on a career ladder; age; teaching experience; the teachers' assignment as to grade and subject; principals' leadership, support and expectations; pre-training knowledge and attitude; and how in-danger a teacher is professionally.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Several research questions need to be considered. How can teacher attitude toward selected content be assessed with accuracy? Is it attitude or commitment that should be assessed? Are attitude and commitment synonymous? Is there a difference between elementary and secondary teachers' degree of implementation with regard to the independent variables of this study? What is the role of the principal in a teacher's implementation of inservice training? These and other questions remain to be answered before educators interested in improvement of teaching through inservice

training can be confident that the content and delivery of inservice will be transferred to the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arin-Krupp, Judy, (1981), Adult Development, Manchester:Connecticut, RISE.

_____, (1982), The Adult Learner, Manchester:Connecticut, RISE.

Bents, R. H. and Howey, K. R, (1981), "Staff Development--Change in the Individual", Staff Development/Organization Development, Alexandria, Virginia, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M., (1978), Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations, Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation

Cooley, V.E. and Thompson, Jr., J.C., (1987), "A Comparison of Outstanding and Randomly Selected District Staff Development Practices in Fifty States", The Developer, Dearborn:Michigan, National Staff Development Council.

Cox, Pat L., (1983), "Complementary Roles in Successful Change", Educational Change, 41, 10-13.

Ducharme, Edward and Kluender, Mary, (1986), "Good Teachers in Good Schools: Some Reflections," Educational Leadership, 44, 43-46.

Evans, Pamela R., (1982), "Improving Instruction Through PET", Educational Leadership, 40, 44-45.

Fullan, Michael, (1982), The Meaning of Educational Change, New York: Teachers College Press.

Glickman, Carl, (1985), Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodlad, John, (1983), A Place Called School, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Guskey, Thomas R., (1986), "Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change", Educational Researcher, 15, 5-12.

Hall, G. and Loucks, S., (1977), "A Developmental Model for Determining Whether the Treatment is Actually Implemented", American Educational Research Journal, 14, 263-276.

Harris, B. M., (1975), Improving Staff Performance Through In-Service Education, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hunter, Madeline, (1986), "Comments on the Napa County, California, Follow-Through Project", The Elementary School Journal, 87, 173-179.

_____, (1985), "What's Wrong with Madeline Hunter?," Educational Leadership, 42, 57-60.

Joyce, Bruce and Showers, Beverly, (1980), "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research", Educational Leadership, 37, 379-385.

Joyce, Bruce and Showers, Beverly, (1981), "Teacher Training Research: Working Hypotheses for Program Design and Directions for Further Study", Paper presented before the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles: California.

Joyce, B., Hersh, R. H., and McKibbin, M. K., (1983), The Structure of School Improvement, New York: Longman, Inc.

Lawrence, Gordon, (1981), "A Synthesis on the Effectiveness of Staff Development Programs", Paper presented before the State of Ohio Department of Education Annual Çonference on Inservice Education.

McCormick, William J., "Teachers Can Learn to Teach More Effectively", Educational Leadership, 37, 59-60.

Mohlman, G, Çoladarci, T. and Gage, N.L.,(1982), "Comprehension and Attitude as Predictors of Implementation of Teacher Training", Journal of Teacher Education, 33, 31-36.

National Commission on Excellence in Education, (1983), A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington: United States Department of Education.

O'Neill, Alexis, (1986), "New Research on Inservice: Essential Factors of District-Wide Programs", Paper presented before the National Council of States on Inservice Education, Nashville: Tennessee.

Robbins, Pamela, (1986), "The Napa-Vacaville Follow-Through Project: Qualitative Outcomes, Related Procedures, and Implications for Practice", Elementary School Journal, 87, 139-157.

Slavin, Robert E., (1986), "The Napa Evaluation of Madeline Hunter's ITIP: Lessons Learned", The Elementary School Journal, 87, 165-172.

Wood, Fred and Thompson, Steven R., (1980) , "Guidelines for Better Staff Development", Educational Leadership, 37, 374-378.

APPENDIX

PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING

petl

Richardson Independent School District
400 S. Greenville, Richardson, Texas 75081

PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING (PETL)

A Richardson Staff Development Program

GOAL: The PETL program supports the RISD Strategic Plan goals:

Student Performance: To implement accountable instructional programs for all learners to meet or exceed educational performance standards.

Effective Teachers: To attract and retain the best qualified and most effective teachers.

Innovation: To enrich programs by continually improving the development and use of more effective methods.

Background

This program began in 1982 when five district trainers studied at UCLA with Madeline Hunter. In the spring of 1983, principals, assistant principals, Instruction Services personnel, and twenty-five teachers attended 2½-3 days of inservice. During the 1983-84 school year the personnel of twelve elementary schools and the department chairpersons of the secondary schools received approximately 20 hours of instruction. In 1984-85 all principals, assistant principals, and Central Instruction staff attended four days of inservice on Clinical Supervision and a review of PETL. Starting in 1985-86, the content of PETL I was offered to all professional personnel in the district. This was accomplished by a cadre of district trainers. Included in this cadre were four elementary principals, three assistant principals, and a consulting teacher.

Richardson ISD's support for and commitment to the program was clearly defined with the naming of two full-time trainers for 1986-87. The schedule of seminars was expanded to include not only ETP (Equivalency Time Programs) seminars, but also release days from classroom duties to attend the workshops.

Operation

All professional personnel in RISD are required to complete two days of PETL training by May 1988. Most of the administrative and support personnel have completed this requirement in completing the state required Instructional Leadership Training and the training described in the preceding paragraph. Teachers may earn their PETL credit in a variety of ways including inservice days, release days from classroom duties, and during Equivalency Time Programs

Nancy Britton - Lynda Speak
Staff Development Specialists
214-238-8111

(ETP) offered on non-school time. It is anticipated that all professional personnel with two or more years with the district will complete the two-day requirement by May 1988.

Teachers who participate in the PETL training are asked to assume responsibility for their own learning by completing a self-commitment form at the conclusion of PETL II indicating their intent to follow-up the training. This follow-up ranges from self-follow-up to a classroom observation by one of the PETL specialists. Principals receive copies of the self-commitment and are aware of the necessity of follow-up if implementation is to occur and if maintenance of the teaching strategies is to continue.

An assessment of the teachers' knowledge of and anticipated use of PETL concepts is completed during the PETL II seminars. Teachers are informed of their scores on the content assessment in a follow-up letter.

For the 1987-88 school year, three types of PETL seminars are offered: PETL I, PETL II, and Advanced PETL. PETL I is the beginning level and is offered mainly for teachers who are new to RISD. The content consists of an overview to the essential elements of teaching and content sessions on Teaching to the Objective, Active Participation, and Anticipatory Set.

PETL II is for professional employees who have completed PETL I. The content includes a review of key PETL I objectives and new content sessions on Formulating Objectives, Task Analysis, Motivation Theory, and Closure.

Advanced PETL is offered for teachers who participated in the PETL pilot in 1983-84 and for teachers who have completed PETL I and II. The content includes a review of Bloom's Taxonomy, Anticipatory Set, and Closure, as well as new content on extending student thinking through the four teacher actions of Teaching to the Objective. A method of presenting information and activities that encourages higher levels of thinking is presented. Questioning strategies and responding techniques for promoting higher levels of thinking are discussed.

EVALUATION

Directions: Please circle the response which best represents your reaction to each of the items below.

	Very Much So ←				→ Not At All
	5	4	3	2	1
35. The seminar objectives were clearly established.	5	4	3	2	1
36. The seminar objectives were met.	5	4	3	2	1
37. The amount of time allowed for interaction was satisfactory.	5	4	3	2	1
38. The leader/s was/were knowledgeable with respect to materials and concepts presented.	5	4	3	2	1
39. The seminar leaders effectively modeled PETL strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
40. The seminar was interesting and held my attention.	5	4	3	2	1
41. The seminar increased my knowledge of the subjects covered.	5	4	3	2	1
42. The information presented in the seminar is immediately applicable to my current assignment.	5	4	3	2	1
43. The seminar introduced concepts or skills for increasing the level of my competence as an educator.	5	4	3	2	1
44. The seminar has stimulated my enthusiasm to try different ideas and approaches.	5	4	3	2	1
45. The seminar met my objectives as a participant.	5	4	3	2	1
To what degree do you see yourself incorporating these topics in your teaching?					
46. Anticipatory Set	5	4	3	2	1
47. Active Participation	5	4	3	2	1
48. Teaching to the Objective	5	4	3	2	1
49. Selecting Objectives at the Correct Level of Difficulty	5	4	3	2	1
50. Principles of Motivation	5	4	3	2	1
51. Closure	5	4	3	2	1

PLEASE COMMENT ON ANY ASPECT OF THE INSERVICE AND LIST NEEDS FOR FUTURE INSERVICE SEMINARS.

PETL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION - 1986

(Prepared by Lynda Speak and Nancy Britton - Richardson ISD)

Teacher's Name _____ Date of Observation _____

bserver _____ Subject _____ School _____

A/BE = Absent or Below Expectation; SE = Standard Expectation; EQ = Exceptional Quality

	A/BE	SE	EQ
ANTICIPATORY SET			
Teacher demonstrates the ability to use an anticipatory set that:			
--is congruent to the objective	0	1	1
--uses active student participation	0	1	1
--transfers past experience/previous knowledge	0	1	1
TEACHING TO THE OBJECTIVE			
Information and/or explanation was congruent to the lesson objective	0	1	1
Questions asked of the students were congruent to the lesson objective	0	1	1
Activities were congruent to the lesson objective	0	1	1
Responses to the learners' behavior were congruent to the lesson objective	0	1	1
ACTIVE PARTICIPATION			
Teacher demonstrates the ability to:			
--use covert active participation	0	1	1
--use overt active participation	0	1	1

	A/BE	SE	EQ
TASK ANALYSIS			
Teacher demonstrates the ability to:			
--formulate a task analysis	0	1	1
--use a task analysis to plan for instruction	0	1	1
--teach essential sub-objectives leading to the terminal objective	0	1	1
MOTIVATION			
Teacher demonstrates the ability to use the variables of motivation:			
--anxiety (level of concern)	0	1	1
--success	0	1	1
--knowledge of results	0	1	1
--interest	0	1	1
--feeling tone	0	1	1
CLOSURE			
Teacher demonstrates the ability to use the principle of closure.			
--closure is congruent to the lesson objective	0	1	1
--closure has student active participation	0	1	1
--closure has students summarize the learning	0	1	1